

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12 were presented for examination. By the 12 were presented in the aforementioned Office Action, Claims 1-10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. Claims 1, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 2-4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

By this Amendment, Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as his invention, and also to address the rejections of the Examiner. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-10 and 12 are currently pending, and reconsideration of the Office Action is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth below.

**1. Restriction under 35. U.S.C. 121**

This is to confirm that an election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, Claims 1-10 and 12.

**2. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to clarify that "the instruction" includes:

- i) providing a user name and password for accessing the sub-computer system,
- ii) selecting a first piece of data to be transferred, and
- iii) designating the target computer system to which the first piece of data is to be transferred.

Accordingly, the applicant submits that Claims 1 and 12 as currently amended distinctly claim the subject matter which he regards as his invention, and requests the Examiner to withdraw his rejections under 35 U.S.C 112.

The applicant would like to point out that Singhal did not disclose creating an instruction in the client device having all of the following:

- i) a user name and password for accessing the sub-computer and system;
- ii) selecting a first piece of data to be transferred, and
- iii) designating the target computer system to which the first piece of data is to be transferred.

Specifically, there was no mention in Singhal of any user name and password in the message sent by the client device.

In addition, Singhal did not disclose that the gateway (or the Mobile Access Gateway with extended Mobile Message Processor) converts the instruction received from the mobile device (or client device) into an HTTP format. According to Singhal, the instruction in the ACM of the message was not sent to the email server, but was read and processed at the gateway. Accordingly, the teachings of Singhal are different from that as recited in Claim 1. Furthermore, Singhal also did not suggest converting the instruction to the HTTP format as recited in Claim 1 since such a conversion would not be needed.

Furthermore, Singhal did not disclose the transmitting of data from the sub-computer system to the target computer system as recited in Claim 1. Specifically, there was no mention that any data was transferred between any two client machines in the teachings of Singhal. If the data to be transferred refers to the message ID according to the Examiner, the applicant respectfully points out that the message ID was simply used by the gateway to retrieve the email from the email server (col 6, line 42-44). The message ID was not transferred between any two client machines. Even if the data refers to the attachment to be printed by the printer Oak, it is noted that the attachment was transferred directly from the server or gateway to the printer Oak to be printed, and not transferred between any two client machines.

Accordingly, the subject matters of Claim 1, and Claims 2-10 dependent thereof, are novel over Singhal, and hence, allowable.

**3. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 2, 3, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Singhal in view of Peng (U.S. patent 6,816,944).

Peng discloses a method for managing information in a mobile device. A first set of files is downloaded, and it is determined whether a local cache has enough space to store the downloaded first set of files. If the local cache has enough space, the first set of files is stored in the local cache. Otherwise, a second set of files corresponding to an out-dated record is removed from the local cache until there is enough space in the local cache to store the first set of files (see abstract). In a mobile communications network, each mobile device communicates to servers on the Internet through gateways. The first set of files corresponds to frequently used applications and data sets, which are cached at the gateways. The applications and data sets stored in the local cache of the gateways are provided to the mobile device upon request (col 14, lines 1-17).

The applicant submits that Claims 2 and 12 recite that the information relating to identifications of the plurality of data is stored in the central computer system. In contradistinction, Peng discloses that such information (or frequently used applications and data sets) is stored in the gateway. The gateway as disclosed in Peng connects each mobile device to servers on the Internet (col 14, lines 1-5), and hence, is different from the central computer system recited in the claimed invention.

In addition, Peng teaches that the storing of such information in the gateway would result in information to be delivered to the mobile clients faster than when the information is stored in the server (col 14, line 1-17). Therefore, Peng not only does not suggest the storing of such information in the central

computer system as recited in Claims 2 and 12, it teaches someone who reads the disclosure of Peng away from doing so.

Accordingly, the subject matters of Claims 2 and 12, and Claim 3 which depends on Claim 2 are patentable over Singhal in view of Peng. Claim 2 is patentable over Singhal.

#### 4 Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to allow the pending Claims 1-10 and 12, and to issue a Notice of Allowance for the present application.

Date: February 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Thi Dang  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 53,877  
Tel. No.: (656) 374 8599(Singapore)/  
(650) 857- 3058(Palo Alto)